



CRM-M-61198-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

117

CRM-M-61198-2025
Date of Decision: 25.03.2026

HARPREET SINGH

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. B.S.Bhalla, Advocate the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 193 dated 19.09.2023 under Section 420 of IPC registered at Police Station City South Moga.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner received a sum of ₹8 lakhs from the complainant on the pretext of sending him abroad.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no connection with the alleged occurrence. She further submits that a complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act was initially filed, however, the same was dismissed in default. During the pendency of the said complaint, the present FIR came to be registered. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 01.07.2025 and prays for grant of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. P.S. Pandher, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner,



which is taken on record. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 8 months and 21 days, is involved in two other cases. Challan has been presented and out of 12 cited prosecution witnesses, only one witness has been partly examined so far.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions and considering that the petitioner is in custody for the last 8 months and 21 days; out of 12 cited prosecution witnesses, only one witness has been partly examined so far and the trial is likely to take considerable time, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served by further incarceration of the petitioner. Moreover, it is a settled principle of law that *“bail is the rule and jail is the exception.”* Accordingly, the petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

25.03.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No